



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,219	12/21/2001	Robert M. Coleman	D/A0060Q	9057
7590	07/27/2005			
			EXAMINER	
			MURPHY, DILLON J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/024,219	COLEMAN, ROBERT M.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dillon J. Murphy	2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/21/2001</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the legal term "said printer" is incorporated in lines 5 and 13. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "implements" on page 16, line 21, should be –implemented--.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "Load" selection, #21, mentioned on page 10, line 7, "printer imaging actions," #48 on page 18, line 13, "load control," #45 on page 18, line 15, and "output user interface" #35 on page 19, line 14. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2624

CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 9, "PLD" should be --PDL--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 5,704,021), Parkhurst et al. (US 5,642,474), and Parkhurst et al. (Hewlett-Packard Journal, February 1994).

Regarding claim 1, Smith et al. teach a printing method wherein the electronic document includes at least one imaging object (Smith, col 3, ln 25-30, document includes a plurality of document types, wherein processing occurs in computer, #44 of figure 2A, in an electronic format), converting the electronic document into print data and rendering data in accordance with a page description language (Smith, col 3, ln 31-36, method comprises color-rendering options for processing said document and said

objects), and associating at least one printer-independent print-quality characteristic with the at least one image object (col 7, ln 35-39, color modes are set for different objects such as text, graphics, and photographic images). Smith does not expressly disclose inserting the association information in the PDL file. Parkhurst et al. ('474) discloses inserting the association information in the PDL file (Parkhurst '474, col 4, ln 12-13, PCL file is sent to printer, therefore, print data in the form of the PDL file comprises association information).

Smith et al. and Parkhurst et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of generating print data and sending said data to a printer. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of inserting the association information into a PDL file as taught by Parkhurst et al. with the method of providing an electronic document with an image object, converting said document into print data, and associating a printer-independent print-quality characteristic with said image object as taught by Smith et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to simplify fill processes and reduce memory and complexity of processing by providing a page description language that describes shapes as coordinates and primitives and describes text as characters and fonts rather than the appearance of fonts (Parkhurst et al. '474, col 1, ln 38-45).

The combination of Smith et al. and Parkhurst et al. teaches a method of printing wherein an electronic document is provided with an image object, converting said document into print data, associating a printer-independent print-quality characteristic with said image object, and inserting the association information into a PDL file.

Although Smith et al. discloses associating printer-independent print-quality characteristics with image objects, and Parkhurst et al. ('474) discloses the use of PDL files in printing, the combination of Smith et al. and Parkhurst et al. ('474) does not disclose expressly the use of printer-independent print-quality characteristics in a PDL file. The Parkhurst et al. Journal reference titled "Connectivity of the HP DeskJet 1200C Printer" teaches the explicit use of PCL in the HP DeskJet 1200C printer (Parkhurst et al. Journal, page 85, paragraph 1 under "PCL 5C Language Firmware" subheading), while also teaching that the PCL specifies print attributes in a device independent fashion (Parkhurst et al. Journal, page 87, paragraph 1 under "Raster Operations" subheading).

The Parkhurst et al. journal article is combinable with the aforementioned combination of Smith et al. and Parkhurst et al. ('474) because the Parkhurst et al. journal article is incorporated by reference into the Parkhurst et al. patent (Parkhurst et al., '474, col 1, ln 22-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Parkhurst et al. Journal article with the combination of Smith et al. and Parkhurst et al. ('474) to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, which depends from claim 1, the combination of Smith et al., Parkhurst et al. ('474), and Parkhurst et al. (HP Journal) teach a method for creating a page description language description of an electronic document wherein the image object has an object type and wherein the associating step comprises the steps of:

Providing a list of object types (Smith et al., figure 2B, #80, list of object types is provided in a user interface allowing user to choose between color text, color charts, or color photos);

Providing a list of printer-independent print-quality characteristics (Smith et al., figure 2B, #80, list comprises color options such as color control and halftone. Also see the Parkhurst et al. journal reference, page 94, paragraph 1, under "Document" subheading, wherein print-quality characteristics are printer-independent);

Selecting the image object's object type from the list of object types (Smith et al., figure 2B, #80, the user makes selections from object type list); and

Associating at least one printer-independent print-quality characteristic with the selected object type (Smith et al., col 6, ln 4-14, print-quality characteristics are associated with object type).

Regarding claim 3, which depends from claim 1, the combination of Smith et al., Parkhurst et al. ('474), and Parkhurst et al. (HP Journal) teach a method for creating a page description language description of an electronic document wherein the associating step further comprises:

Providing a list of object descriptors for the image object (Smith et al., figure 4, #60, user can select from list of fonts to describe text, and also #65, print quality, where user can generally describe print quality and speed); and

Associating at least one printer-independent print-quality characteristic with each of said object descriptors (Parkhurst et al., HP Journal, page 87, paragraph 2 under

"Parser" subheading, where printer-independent print-quality characteristics of text such as typeface, location on the page, and point size are associated with object descriptors).

Regarding claim 4, which depends from claim 3, the combination of Smith et al., Parkhurst et al. ('474), and Parkhurst et al. (HP Journal) teach a method for creating a page description language description of an electronic document further comprising:

Defining a custom object descriptor for the image object (Smith et al., figure 5, #96, lightness slider customizes colors of image object, and lookup table colors #97, allows user to map to custom colors);

Adding the custom object descriptor to the list of object descriptors (Smith et al., col 8, In 11-16, custom colors are mapped to text, graphics, and photos); and

Associating at least one printer-independent print-quality characteristic with said custom object descriptor (Smith et al., col 2, In 59-61, color settings are printer-independent print-quality characteristic, wherein color settings are changed in the "Printed Color Control" user interface and applied to object descriptors).

Regarding claim 5, which depends from claim 1, the combination of Smith et al., Parkhurst et al. ('474), and Parkhurst et al. (HP Journal) teach a method for creating a page description language description of an electronic document further comprising:

Providing a default set of associations for use by the page description language, wherein the default set comprises a plurality of object types and at least one printer-independent print-quality characteristic associated with each of said plurality of object types (Smith et al., col 8, In 1-5, default button provides default print settings for print

job, and also figure 5, #80, wherein user can select automatic button for recommended settings to be applied to object types); and

Inserting the default set in the PDL file (Parkhurst '474, col 4, ln 12-13, PCL file is sent to printer, therefore, print data with default set is inserted into the PDL file).

Regarding claim 6, which depends from claim 3, the combination of Smith et al., Parkhurst et al. ('474), and Parkhurst et al. (HP Journal) teach a method for creating a page description language description of an electronic document further comprising inserting the list of object descriptors for the image object in the PDL file (Parkhurst et al., HP Journal, page 87, paragraph 2 under "Parser" subheading, where object descriptors are inserted into PCL file in the form of location of text).

Regarding claim 7, which depends from claim 1, the combination of Smith et al., Parkhurst et al. ('474), and Parkhurst et al. (HP Journal) teach a method for creating a page description language description of an electronic document further comprising:

Identifying locations of the image object in the document (Parkhurst et al., HP Journal, page 85, paragraph 3 under "Parser" subheading, rectangles, i.e. image objects, are identified by location), and inserting the printer-independent print quality-characteristic at the identified location with the image object (Parkhurst et al., HP Journal, page 86, paragraph 5 of "Parser" subheading, object descriptor such as color is applied to image object with corresponding location).

Regarding claim 9, which depends from claim 1, the combination of Smith et al., Parkhurst et al. ('474), and Parkhurst et al. (HP Journal) teach a method for creating a page description language description of an electronic document further comprising

inserting the association information in the PLD file by location of the particular image object (Parkhurst et al., HP Journal, page 86, paragraph 5 of "Parser" subheading, printer-independent print-quality characteristics such as color is associated with image object, such as text or graphics, at a corresponding location)

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (US 5,704,021), Parkhurst et al. (US 5,642,474), and Parkhurst et al. (Hewlett-Packard Journal, February 1994) as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, and further in view of Palmer (US 6,078,403).

Regarding claim 8, which depends from claim 3, the combination of Smith et al., Parkhurst et al. ('474), and Parkhurst et al. (HP Journal) teaches a method of creating a PDL of an electronic document comprising providing an electronic document with an image object, converting said document into print data and generating a PDL, associating print-independent print-quality characteristics with an image object, providing a list of object descriptors for the image object, and associating a print-independent print-quality characteristic with said object descriptors. The combination does not teach adding PDL comments for each object descriptor. The Palmer reference does teach adding PDL comments for each object descriptors (Palmer, col 4, ln 52-56, invention relates to associating parameters with text and other data objects in documents, wherein size and format information are encoded in a document with page description language comments, col 5, ln 53-57 and #86 in figure 4).

Palmer is combinable with the aforementioned combination of Smith et al., Parkhurst et al., and Parkhurst et al. because they are from the same field of endeavor

of generating print data for objects in printing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the PDL comments of Palmer with the methods of associating printer-independent print-quality characteristics with image objects and object descriptors in a PDL as described in claim 3. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide comment statements within a base document without the variable data associations being present in the base document (Palmer, col 6 , ln 1-8). Additionally, Parkhurst et al. teaches that the PDL of the printer embodied in the reference comprises HP's Printer Control Language and PostScript, thereby allowing for printer-independent print-quality characteristics to be expressed in a plurality of high-level languages (HP Journal, page 95, paragraph 4 of "Documents" subheading). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Palmer with the combination of Smith et al., Parkhurst et al. ('474), and Parkhurst et al. (HP Journal) to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dillon J. Murphy whose telephone number is (571) 272-5945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800